

Church Union

News and Views

Organ of the Continuation Committee

of the

South India Joint Committee on Union

Vol. III

NOVEMBER 1932

No. 3

CONTENTS

	PAGE
MESSAGE FROM THE KING ON CHURCH UNION	71
INTERCOMMUNION. By DR. A. E. GARVIE	78
THE SPIRITUAL CONTRIBUTION OF METHODISM TO SOUTH INDIA	
CHURCH UNION. By REV. W. E. TOMLINSON	80
CONFIRMATION. By REV. A. MICHAEL HOLLIS	89
REUNION WITH NONCONFORMISTS. By THE BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER ...	95

THE CHRISTIAN LITERATURE SOCIETY FOR INDIA

Post Box 501, Park Town, Madras

1932

THE Christian Literature Society for India

POST BOX 501, PARK TOWN, MADRAS.

The Christian Literature Society takes pleasure in announcing that the Tamil and Telugu Editions of the Scheme of Union are now available at 4 annas per copy subject to the usual 25% discount to Missionaries and Ministers. Postage extra. They also wish to announce that the Tamil and Telugu editions of the 'Scheme of Union Explained' may now be obtained at the reduced price of 2 annas a copy net.

SPECIAL INTERCESSION AND PRAYERS FOR UNITY

Issued by the Continuation Committee

Available in English and in Tamil

Price, Rs. 2-8-0 per 100

CHURCH UNION

News and Views

Editorial Board

THE LORD BISHOP OF MADRAS

REV. J. S. M. HOOPER, M.A.

REV. J. J. BANNINGA, D.D.

PASUMALAI, S. INDIA,

(*Managing Editor.*)

Publishers

THE CHRISTIAN LITERATURE SOCIETY, PARK TOWN, MADRAS.

Vol. III

NOVEMBER 1932

No. 3

The Message from the King

At the Methodist Reunion in London in September, the Duke of York read a Message from the King Emperor in which the following sentences occur:—

‘I congratulate the Uniting Churches on the attainment of this happy result. They may well see in it a token of divine guidance and blessing. I welcome it as marking one step towards the unity of all Christian people—a cause which is always near my heart.’

In reply to this Message the Conference said, among other things:—

‘The Conference also hopes that this Union may tend towards that increased unity of Christian people which Your Majesty has so much at heart.’

Extracts from the Addresses at the Methodist Reunion

The Bishop of London representing the Church of England was present and received a great ovation when called upon by the President to address the Conference. Among other things he said :—

‘Why should not all Christians come together in one Church? That is what we have been discussing at London House for two years. There we had High Churchmen, Evangelicans, and Wesleyans talking together and arriving at a glorious agreement. It is a disappointment to us that the union we have been talking about has not yet been consummated. We can see now that the Methodist Union is to take place first. But now is the time to go on to the further Union.’

Dr. Hugh Mackintosh, Moderator of the Church of Scotland, said :—

‘The Church of Scotland has sent my fellow-representatives and myself to share in your rejoicings and, as it were, to cheer you on with brotherly faith and prayer as you take that great forward step in the reunion of Christ’s people. We are here to join our hearts and voices in the swelling chorus of good will coming to this Conference from all over the world, and to say in the words of the old Psalm : “We bless you in the name of the Lord”. . . .

‘And now that you are creating a spiritual fellowship that will cover the whole land, your action, thus happily arrived at its goal, will bring good cheer to the hearts of all Churches throughout the world that look eagerly for news of success in healing the wounds of Christ’s Body, and are ready to catch up gladly the inspiration of such leadership. . . .

‘New merits and graces will constantly reveal themselves in the brethren with whom you have become one; new friendships will arise; a larger fund of fresh and inventive ideas for the service of Christ will be created. . . .

‘By the uniting of Divinity Faculties in the Universities with Church Colleges we hope to increase our Scottish facilities for sacred learning and research, to raise the standard of theological education, and to introduce whatever diversity may be wise in the training of

minister and missionary. There too it may well be, happy and rewarding experiences await Methodism under the good hand of God.'

The Rev. H. C. Carter, General Secretary of the Congregational Union of England and Wales, is reported to have said :—

'As spokesman of the Congregational Churches I bring greetings and congratulations. We unfeignedly rejoice in the Union. We in the Congregational Church acknowledge, and not seldom remember, the untellable debt we all owe to the witness the Methodist Churches have borne for nearly two centuries. We pray that this Union may be augury, and inspiration and example to us all to press forward with hope to the doing away with all the disunity that at present obscures our witness and hinders our service in Christ's Church.'

Mr. P. Mander, President of the Churches of Christ, said among other things :—

'This marks a new era not only in the history of Methodism, but in the great Union Movement throughout the whole world.'

The Rev. Dr. S. Parkes Cadman, on behalf of the American Federal Council of Churches in the course of his address, said :—

'The thoroughness, pertinacity, and patience and comprehensive sympathy of the negotiations now consummated have commended themselves to us, and we hope that in the reunions which are now to take place in the United States of America among the people in the Federal Council they will remember your good example, and profit thereby . . .

'If you share Wesley's spirit, if you are baptised into the same baptism, there is no reason at all why you should not expect that the new phase and development of the one organic life in Christ will show results of which you scarcely dared to dream earlier. God has always been working miracles through imperfect men and women. He required only a stable, a manger and a babe, to achieve His ends for the salvation of a world.'

Editorials

Methodist Reunion

The hearts of all men throughout the world who are interested in Christian unity have been greatly encouraged and strengthened by the reunion that has taken place in England by means of which the Wesleyan Methodist, the Primitive Methodist and the United Methodist Churches have become one under the name 'THE METHODIST CHURCH'. This step is in thorough keeping with the general principles laid down by the World Conference on Faith and Order that Churches more closely related to each other should as rapidly as possible become one in order that they may go on to unite further with Churches that are more distantly related to one another in the hopes that ultimately all Christian Churches should become one in fulfilment of the Master's prayer.

Other significant unions of this kind have already taken place, such as the union of the Presbyterian, Methodist and Congregational Churches in Canada; the Union of the Church of Scotland and the United Free Church of Scotland; the Union of the Congregational and the Christian Churches in the United States. We now have this further large and important union among the Methodists in England.

It must not be thought that these are all fruit of the movement known as the World Conference on Faith and Order. As is clearly shown in the documents connected with the Methodist Reunion a motion looking to that consummation was made as much as fifty years ago in one of the Wesleyan Conferences. More distinct efforts toward union began twenty-eight years ago and have now been consummated. Likewise in Scotland and Canada the movements began before 1910 when Bishop Brent first saw the vision which led to the organization of the World Conference on Faith and Order Movement.

An interesting, though not in the least surprising, aspect of the celebrations in London was the fact that from the King Emperor down to the humblest representatives of other Churches the union of the Methodists was looked upon as a step along the line of general Christian unity throughout the world. This is clearly shown by the few quotations to which we are able to give space in this number. But that spirit was found throughout the meetings and that same spirit has been manifest in all parts of the world as men have thought and spoken of this Methodist Reunion. Men everywhere have seen the vision of a united Church. The great leaders in almost all the denominations are confidently looking forward to the not far distant day when all the followers of Christ shall again become one. It is well that we here in South India should share in seeing this vision and should also share in the actual work of bringing about this consummation. We should

all therefore throw ourselves into this work most cordially and enthusiastically being loyal to our own traditions and to what the Lord has thought us of bringing all our wealth into the one Church which our Lord has established and which is His body.

Meeting of the Joint Committee on Union

The Continuation Committee of the South India Movement met in Madras in August and there decided that the next meeting of the Joint Committee should be held in Wesleyan Synod Hall, Royapettah, Madras on November 30 and succeeding days as reported in the September number of CHURCH UNION—NEWS AND VIEWS. It now appears that we will need more time for this meeting than originally intended and a notice has been sent to the members calling them together on the 29th instead of on the 30th and the meeting may last through the third of December instead of ending on the second.

Among the important items of business that will come before the Committee at that time will be :—

1. The draft copies of the Act of Union, the Basis of Union, and Constitution. These have already been considered by the Continuation Committee and will be in printed form, but should receive the careful attention of the Joint Committee before they are sent out to the Churches for their approval.
2. The report of the sub-committee on territorial division, administration and finance.
3. Reports of other sub-committees and of the Continuation Committee on other matters.

The conveners of the three Committees constituting the Joint Committee are preparing a programme of devotional meetings and retreat in connection with this meeting and it is hoped that the whole meeting will be a gathering with spiritual power as well as one carrying out business and administrative affairs.

It is a matter for great rejoicing that at least three bodies of Lutherans in South India have accepted the invitation of the Continuation Committee to send visiting delegates to this meeting. The United Church of Northern India has also been invited to send visiting delegates and it is hoped that they will respond.

Inasmuch as this meeting of the Committee will be in many respects crucial the prayers of all those interested in the Kingdom of God are asked for prayer on behalf of this meeting so that in every way, in every detail the spirit of God may lead all the members to a common mind which shall work out to the welfare of His Church not only in South India but throughout the world.

The International Missionary Council and Church Union

The members of the International Missionary Council met in Herrnhut, Germany, in July, 1932, and there considered many important matters connected with World-wide Missions.

The President of that Council, John R. Mott, was commissioned to write a message to the World Mission at this time on world crisis. Dr. Mott wrote this message as he was returning to America on the *S.S. Aquitania*. With his usual clearness and masterliness Dr. Mott in this message reviews several aspects of ecumenical Missions. But his final words are of such deep import and of such clear vision that we feel we must publish them in **CHURCH UNION—NEWS AND VIEWS**.

Dr. Mott feels, and the International Council agreed with him in this matter, that there was an imperative demand to enter upon the third stage of co-operation in Missions. To us engaged in Church Union Movement it certainly is a great inspiration to find that the men who are leading the whole world movement of Missions realise that in the unity of Christian Church here on earth as far as men are concerned the surest and best method of advancing the Kingdom of God. For some time past there have been various efforts in union in educational and medical work, but the International Council feels that the time has come when we should go much further than that and when we should all definitely face the problem of one Church throughout all the world in which all Christians shall dwell together as brethren. This message will certainly give new heart to all engaged in this movement, especially here in South India should we all join together more generally than ever before and recognising the hand of God in all these movements give ourselves in loyal obedience to Him in order that we may carry out His desires.

An Open Letter to the Metropolitan

Some time ago an open letter was published by certain scholars in Oxford strongly condemning the action of the Episcopal Synod of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon for the action they had taken in February, 1932, giving certain liberties to the members of their Church at committee meetings, retreats and conferences organized by the Joint Committee on Union in South India. In the September number of **CHURCH UNION—NEWS AND VIEWS** have published a document from the pen of the Metropolitan of India answering this letter. It now gives us great pleasure to publish in this number another letter addressed to the Bishop of Calcutta, Metropolitan of India, by certain scholars and Church leaders in Oxford.

In this letter the Bishop of Gloucester (Dr. A. C. Headlam), Dr. Edwin James Palmer (formerly Bishop of Bombay), the Bishop of Oxford, the Dean of Exeter and Dr. Watson, Regius Professor, Ecclesiastical History, Oxford, unite in assuring the Metropolitan of India that the Episcopal Synod was thoroughly within its rights in issuing the liberty that they granted in February. These great scholars discuss the general principles involved in that action and come to the conclusion that there is abundant historic evidence in favour of the action that was taken by the Episcopal Synod. It is a matter of rejoicing that men of such prominence should openly take this stand endorsing the Christian and brotherly as well as soundly ecclesiastical action taken by the Episcopal Synod. Such action as this cannot but help along the great cause of Church Union. Nothing brings Christ nearer together than meeting with their Lord at His Table for then the assurance comes to them that they are indeed one in Christ and formal external organization becomes a matter of mutual adjustment and fellowship.

‘Many Ways, but the Old Gospel’

There recently occurred in Great Britain at a place called Marazion a rather unfortunate incident in which a group of ultra-Protestants destroyed certain images and other objects which had been erected in a church by ultra-Catholics and which had been condemned by the Court and had not been removed by the people. This action has caused a lot of discussion in England and practically all admit that it was most unfortunate in every way as it has caused bitterness and division rather than harmony and goodwill within the Christian Church.

But the incident has called forth an article in the *British Weekly* by ‘Ilico’ and we are taking the liberty to print certain extracts from this article which deal with not the incident itself but with such far-reaching principles of worship that we think it of so great value as to desire all our readers to know of this article and to think of the principles involved. It is a great call for comprehension in worship coupled with thorough fellowship and respect for one another. As we have frequently said in the past we probably always will differ from one another in many details, but at the base of our difference there must be a fundamental love for Christ and respect for the brotherhood. They cannot be of the Church of Christ who continue to say with the Pharisee whom Jesus condemned ‘I thank thee, Lord, that I am not like this Publican’, for whether High Church or Low Church all are seeking according to their consciences to worship God as they think best and consequently we have no right to condemn each other, but even along with our difference we should love one another as our Christian brethren. When that love prevails our differences will no longer worry us.

Articles

Intercommunion

1. I gladly comply with the request of the Editor that I should offer my judgement on the question of Intercommunion, which has recently been raised in an acute form in connection with the South India Union proposals. I do not wish to deal with the matter in any controversial spirit, nor to interpose in the discussion among Anglicans. The only remark I shall allow myself in this immediate connexion is that, in view of the past history of the Church of England, the Bishop of Gloucester and those who are associated with him in a common statement are not only as fully entitled to speak for the Anglican communion as the 'theologians in England', to whom the Superior of the Oxford Mission Brotherhood has appealed against the decision of the Episcopal Synod, but do in my judgement express more accurately the general sentiment of the Church of England in such a matter. As a Congregationalist, Nonconformist, Protestant this 'Catholic' legalism seems to me, however much I may respect the men personally, as contrary to the Spirit of Christ as was the Pharisaism of old to the teaching of Jesus.

2. Let me first of all set down some considerations which should be helpful in the approach of the 'Catholic' and the 'Protestant' to one another. I recognise the sacramental principle, God's use of material objects and physical acts as symbols of spiritual reality, using the word symbol in its fullest meaning, as a seal as well as a sign, as conveying as well as expressing to faith the grace of God; I appreciate the Lord's Supper as in this fullest sense a symbol of the self-giving of Christ in His Church to His Church, and I have myself found in it 'the communion of saints' in this common life from and in the Lord; I regard this ordinance as given to the Church by Christ, and as a corporate act of the Church, and accordingly I agree that the celebration should be confined to a representative ministry of the Church acting with the authority and on behalf of the whole body. (As a Congregationalist the Church is for me present in the local congregation, and it may empower a layman when necessary, to act as its representative. For the sake of union I should be prepared to concede this point, and to accept the limitation of this corporate function to the ministry, the ordination of which has won general acceptance).

3. As I hold, however, that the Table is the Lord's and not man's, and in Him as the Head belongs to the whole body of Christ, all believers in Him, and not to any one section, all for whom He is the Son of God and the Saviour of men should be welcomed without any other condition than this sufficient, saving faith; and I should be prepared to admit to the Table any believer, and to partake of the sacred symbols with any who will suffer me to join them. Much as I respect the Bishop of Gloucester, and grateful

as I am to Him for his advocacy of reunion, I cannot as a personal conviction adopt his words. 'I see no reason for doubting the wisdom of recognising that Intercommunion should be the goal and not the means of reunion. There will be neither reverence nor sincerity in joint communions where there is no real fellowship, or desire for fellowship.' I desire and experience fellowship with every Christian, irrespective of any differences of creed, code, ritual or polity which still outwardly divides; and I am convinced that God would use intercommunion as a means of quickening that sense of spiritual unity, which would be the potent motive of reunion. But I admit that this is not at present practical policy. As long as so many churches hold to the position that for fellowship at the Lord's Table agreement on these matters is necessary, insistence on intercommunion would provoke opposition, and retard the movement. Some of my Nonconformist brethren have done me injustice in representing as my personal conviction what I regretfully and reluctantly acquiesce in as practical policy. It is only because I am aware that not only those whom one might describe as Anglo-Catholics, but even men like the Bishop of Gloucester are opposed to general intercommunion that I should advise my Free Church brethren not to make this a condition of further action, nor even to be too insistent in their expression of their desire. As we would resent any violence being done to our own consciences, so should we not attempt to force the consciences of our brethren to the conclusion we desire. We must always remind ourselves that Anglo-Catholics are not the only Christians who regard the communion of the Lord's Table as the token, not of what all Christians hold in common, but of the distinctive principles of a denomination. At the Calvin Celebration in Geneva in 1909, when there was a common celebration in the Cathedral a Reformed pastor gave me as his reason for being absent that the Reformed doctrine of the Supper was so different from the Lutheran.

4. Although I cannot share, I can understand the grounds on which this position is held. I agree with the Bishop of Gloucester that intercommunion would be an unreality, if there were no desire for fellowship but a contented acquiescence in continued divisions. But where as in the case now under consideration definite proposals for union are being seriously discussed and those who are sharing in these discussions are not only animated by the desire for union, but also convinced that God's Spirit is guiding them on the way to reunion, it seems to me no such doubt need be entertained. If even in the thirty years interim period there is to be freedom of conscience in this matter, if Anglicans will be allowed to receive from a non-Anglican celebrant, and an Anglican celebrant will be allowed to accept non-Anglicans at the Table, and if no communicant will be expected to submit in this ordinance to a ministry about which he has any scruples, it seems altogether fitting that there should be an anticipation of that liberty where it is desired as a token of that aspiration for fellowship, which is the

motive of the movement to union. That fellowship at the Table cannot be condemned as wrong before the Union has been finally accomplished which will be approved as right after Union has taken place. I am here indulging in an *argumentum ad hominem*, as such legalities do not touch my own conscience in such a connection. I am briefly putting the argument more fully developed by the Bishop of Calcutta in this journal for September 1932, pp. 41-42. I hesitate to add, but it seems necessary to add in view of the tone of the opponents of intercommunion, that this principle of freedom of conscience must be inalienably secured for the united Church, and guarded against any possible infringement by any ecclesiastical exclusiveness or intolerance.

5. But just as Paul, while asserting the liberty of the conscience in Christ, urged that that liberty should be exercised in charity, so would I ask my non-Anglican brethren not to force intercommunion where there are any hesitations, and not to judge as narrow any Anglicans who do not feel at liberty to participate in such joint celebrations. For we must all now desire that the Lord's Table shall not be made a battle-ground of controversy, instead of being His own tryst for conciliation.

NEW COLLEGE, LONDON,

ALFRED E. GARVIE.

October 10th, 1932.

The Spiritual Contribution of Methodism to South India Church Union

BY THE REV. W. E. TOMLINSON, MYSORE

Any one who denies himself at the request of an editor and writes on such a subject as that at the head of these notes is open to the charge of vainglorying. 'But if thou gloriest, it is not thou that bearest the root, but the root thee', and 'a man can receive nothing, except it hath been given him from heaven'. It is in humble thankfulness to God that these lines are written, a thankfulness all the greater for the knowledge that there is nothing that a century and a half ago was given to Methodism that is not now shared by her sister churches. Through the years Methodist testimony has been received and believed, and today those experiences that were once peculiarly Methodist are the common possession of all the Evangelical communions.

In a sense, then, there is little that Methodism can today bring to any Protestant united church that it may join, in which the other churches of the union do not already rejoice; but there are certain elements of truth and certain facts of experience that those of us who have been born Methodists must always emphasise. There is the doctrine and experience of Assurance.

How can a sinner know
His sins on earth forgiven?
How can my gracious Saviour show
My name inscribed in heaven?

We who in Christ believe
That He for us hath died,
We all His unknown peace receive
And feel His blood applied.

Exults our rising soul,
Disburdened of her load,
And swells unutterably full
Of glory and of God.

We by His Spirit prove
And know the things of God,
The things which freely of His love
He hath on us bestowed.

His Spirit to us He gave,
And dwells in us, we know;
The witness in ourselves we have,
And all its fruits we show.

One may hesitate to write that last line, but there need be no hesitation, for the word of God is sure that we who 'received the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father' have the witness that the Spirit Himself beareth with our spirit, 'that we are children of God: and if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ.' So that we can say to God in equal gratitude and confidence,

Thine in whom I live and move,
Thine the work, the praise is Thine;
Thou art wisdom, power, and love,
And all Thou art is mine.

And in that 'all' is included that fruit of the Spirit which is in all goodness and righteousness and truth.

Assurance does not come unsought. It is given upon conditions. To share 'the speechless awe that dares not move, and all the silent heaven of love' is only possible through 'the mystic joys of penitence'. To many Methodists the old hymns of 'Invitations and Warnings' and the hymns for

'Mourners convinced of sin', with their summary demand for repentance and confession of sin, are true soul-savers, every one of them.

Jesus, the hindrance show,
Which I have feared to see;
Yet let me now consent to know
What keeps me out of Thee.

And the 'Backslider convicted and recovered', like the sinner converted, when the great surrender has been finally made, prays :

Give me, Lord, a holy fear,
And fix it in my heart,
That I may from evil near
With timely care depart;
Sin be more than hell abhorred;
Till Thou destroy the tyrant foe,
Keep me, keep me, gracious Lord,
And never let me go!

Prayers like that of the last two lines quoted are hurtful unless meant in all their fulness, and if they are uttered in sincerity they mean the Methodist doctrine of Perfect Love. John Wesley, writing on Christian Perfection, spoke of 'The humble, gentle, patient love of God and our neighbour ruling our tempers, words and actions . . . This is the whole of Scriptural Perfection . . . There is nothing higher in Religion'. To some of us the most cherished section in all the Methodist Hymn-book is that 'For believers seeking full redemption.' The longing for entire sanctification and the impossibility of the attainment of it in our own strength are both expressed in John Wesley's translation of Tersteegen's great hymn.

Thou hidden love of God, whose height,
Whose depth unfathomed, no man knows,
I see from far Thy beauteous light,
Inly I sigh for thy repose;
My heart is pained, nor can it be
At rest, till it finds rest in Thee.

Thy secret voice invites me still
The sweetness of Thy yoke to prove;
And fain I would : but though my will
Seems fixed, yet wide my passions rove;
Yet hindrances strew all the way;
I aim at Thee, yet from Thee stray.

'Tis mercy all, that Thou hast brought
 My mind to seek her peace in Thee;
 Yet, while I seek but find Thee not,
 No peace my wandering soul shall see :
 O when shall all my wanderings end,
 And all my steps to Thee-ward tend !

Is there a thing beneath the sun
 That strives with Thee my heart to share?
 Ah, tear it thence, and reign alone,
 The Lord of every motion there !
 Then shall my heart from earth be free,
 When it hath found repose in Thee.

O hide this self from me, that I
 No more, but Christ in me, may live !
 My vile affections crucify,
 Nor let one darling lust survive !
 In all things nothing may I see,
 Nothing desire or seek, but Thee !

Each moment draw from earth away
 My heart, that lowly waits Thy call;
 Speak to my inmost soul, and say,
 I am thy Love, thy God, thy All !
 To feel Thy power, to hear Thy voice,
 To taste Thy love, be all my choice.

The fruit of endurance, sustained by God's infinite grace, has been proved by many a Methodist even while he has been singing the hymn 'My God! I know, I feel Thee mine', for before its end has been reached the 'refining fire' of the Holy Spirit's presence and power has gone through his heart, illuminated his soul, and sanctified him wholly. Once when I had preached on this subject, a missionary friend chid me gently—'That is high doctrine'. Of course it is, and nothing else befits the height of the love of God. Is there any other doctrine that is so definitely and so generally proclaimed by all the apostolic writers? 'I can do all things in him that strengtheneth me'. 'Your life is hid with Christ in God.' 'The God of peace sanctify you wholly.' 'Now the God of peace make you perfect in every good thing to do His will'. 'Pure religion is to keep himself unspotted from the world'. 'Like as he which called you is holy, be ye yourselves holy in all manner of living; Because it is written, Ye shall be holy; for I am holy.' 'Now unto him that is able to guard you from stumbling . . . be glory.' 'Whosoever is begotten of God doeth no sin, because his seed abideth in him : and he cannot sin, because he is begotten of God'. Aposto-

lic unanimity could hardly be more complete than it is in the declaration that the believer whose heart is surrendered to God and who lives by the power of Christ's resurrection and is the home of the indwelling Spirit is set on high in heavenly places, and not only need not but actually does not sin. Is there anything in all experience more divinely natural than this?

All things are possible to God
 To Christ the power of God in man,
 To me, when I am all renewed,
 When I in Christ am formed again,
 And witness, from all sin set free,
 All things are possible to me.

 He wills that I should holy be;
 What can withstand His will?
 The counsel of His grace in me
 He surely shall fulfil.

Perfect love is not only offered to God, it works for man. It is no accident that the 'Full Redemption' section of the Hymn-book is followed by hymns on 'Service and Influence.' Dr. Scott Lidgett, in his Presidential Address at the Conference in September that united Methodism, spoke memorable words on the need of the world today for the service that only perfect love can offer.

Jesus, I fain would find
 Thy zeal for God in me,
 Thy yearning pity for mankind,
 Thy burning charity.

 In me Thy Spirit dwell;
 In me Thy mercies move :
 So shall the fervour of my zeal
 Be the pure flame of love.

Almost the weakest section of the Methodist Hymn-book is its missionary section. We can bear that reproach, because every section treating of Christian experience is shot through with missionary appeal. This is as it should be, as it inevitably must be, wherever religion is vital. In the 'Full Redemption' section of the Hymn-book, the hymn in whose first verse are the words :

Give me the faith which can remove
 And sink the mountain to a plain;

 Thy love let it my heart o'erpower
 And all my simple soul devour,

at once forgets itself and its remaining four verses are a passionate outpouring of missionary desire.

My talents, gifts, and graces, Lord,
 Into Thy blessed hands receive;
 And let me live to preach Thy word,
 And let me to Thy glory live;
 My every sacred moment spend
 In publishing the sinner's Friend.

Enlarge, inflame, and fill my heart
 With boundless charity divine!
 So shall I all my strength exert,
 And love them with a zeal like Thine;
 And lead them to Thy open side,
 The sheep for whom their Shepherd died.

Here is full redemption at its redeeming work! In the section of the Hymn-book 'For believers in communion with God' is the perfect missionary hymn:

What shall I do my God to love,
 My Saviour, and the world's, to praise?
 Whose tenderest compassions move
 To me and all the fallen race,
 Whose mercy is divinely free
 For all the fallen race and —me!

You cannot be in communion with God without longing and living to bring others into the divine fellowship. 'O let me commend my Saviour to you!' This too is the way of the New Testament. Peter and John mix their pronouns as deliberately as does Paul. 'My God shall fulfil every need of *yours*.' 'Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who . . . begat us again unto a living hope . . . unto an inheritance . . . reserved in heaven for *you*.' 'These things we write that *your* joy' (or 'our joy'—it may be either, for it is both) 'may be fulfilled.' Christian experience will not have it otherwise.

My Saviour! how shall I proclaim,
 How pay the mighty debt I owe?
 Let all I have, and all I am,
 Ceaseless to all Thy glory show.

Conversely, so far as the salvation of the world depends on me, it depends on me as entirely sanctified.

God of all power, and truth, and grace,
Which shall from age to age endure,
Whose word, when heaven and earth shall pass,
Remains and stands for ever sure;

That I Thy mercy may proclaim,
That all mankind Thy truth may see,
Hallow Thy great and glorious name,
And perfect holiness in me.

If this teaching, like much other teaching suggested by other verses already quoted, is discerned by some to be that of the Oxford Group Movement, then so much the better for Methodism, and for the Movement, and for all whom Methodism and the Movement may affect.

These lines have been written in camp, with no other Methodist standard of doctrine or handbook of experience within reach than the Hymn-book and the writer's own heart; but if all our standards and our text-books had been at hand, these notes could hardly have been different. The Hymn-book contains the creed we sing. If we bring our experience of God in Christ, through the Holy Spirit, into the united Church we have brought our all. Our prayer as we consider Church Union is a prayer for all Christian people, those with whom we pray soon to be united, and others not included in the present proposals.

Jesus, from whom all blessings flow,
Great Builder of Thy Church below,
If now Thy Spirit moves my breast,
Hear and fulfil Thine own request!

The few that truly call Thee Lord,
And wait Thy sanctifying word,
And Thee their utmost Saviour own,
Unite, and perfect them in one.

O let them all Thy mind express,
Stand forth Thy chosen witnesses,
Thy power unto salvation show,
And perfect holiness below!

From every spot and wrinkle free,
Redeemed from all iniquity,
The fellowship of saints make known;
And, O my God, might I be one!

Diocesan Areas

At the Bangalore meeting of the Joint Committee on Union in June, 1932, a sub-committee was appointed to investigate the whole question of territorial division, administration and finance. At a meeting of the Continuation Committee held in Madras in August, 1932, that sub-committee reported and after very thorough discussion on the part of all members of the Continuation Committee the following resolutions were adopted :—

'The resolutions of the Bangalore meeting of June, 1932, were noted and these were accepted as general principles guiding the Committee in these arrangements. These are as follows :

- (i) That there should be in the united Church initially from 10 to 12 dioceses, possibly with assistant bishops in some cases.
- (ii) That in the formation of dioceses it is desirable, where feasible, that a diocese should contain congregations of not less than two out of the three uniting Churches.
- (iii) That the Church in each diocese should aim at ultimately taking full responsibility for the whole of the Christian work in the diocese, but that initially the existing systems of mission and other administration should remain as they are, except for such changes as are directly required by the union and by the formation of the dioceses, provided that where Missionary Societies desire, they may at once enter into relations with the dioceses and their diocesan council.
- (iv) That the administrative bodies other than diocesan bodies which will thus function during the first years after the inauguration of union should be co-ordinated mutually and in relation to the dioceses by means of diocesan committees or otherwise.

In addition it was voted that all proposals now made are only suggestive and are submitted to the Joint Committee with the suggestion that, if approved, their recommendations be sent to the Churches and areas concerned for further consideration and to call forth their opinions.

With this understanding the following Diocesan areas are suggested :—

I. The S.I.U.C. Council Area of Travancore.

Note 1. The Bishop of this area and the present Bishop of Travancore and Cochin will come to some agreement as to the best arrangement for the supervision of the Anglican Churches in Quilon and Trivandrum.

Note 2. If at any time in the future the Malayalam section of the present S.I.U.C. field should wish to join the present Diocese of North Travancore such a step should, of course, be open to them. Similarly if any part of the present Tinnevely Diocese bordering on Travancore should wish

to join the S. Travancore Diocesan Council the way should be open for them to do so.

Note 3. Though it does not now seem feasible to observe the second instruction of the Bangalore meeting, and put parts of two Churches into this area, it is hoped that the Bishop in S. Travancore and the Bishops of Tinnevely and Travancore and Cochin should work together in the closest possible consultation and co-operation.

II. *The Tinnevely District.*

III. *North Travancore and Cochin together with the Malabar District of the S.I.U.C.*

Note. If S. Kanara and S. Marathi of the Basel Missionary Society should choose to come into the united Church, the question of organizing these areas together with Malabar into a separate Diocese should be considered.

IV. *Madura and Ramnad Districts and the Jaffna Church Council of the S.I.U.C.*

Note. If the Wesleyan and Anglican Churches in Ceylon should choose to come into the united Church, Jaffna would naturally be connected with them.

V. *The Districts of Trichinopoly, Tanjore, Coimbatore and Salem and the Pudukottai State.*

VI. *The Districts of Madras, Chingleput, North Arcot, South Arcot, Chittoor, Nellore and the Nilgiris.*

VII. *Mysore State, Coorg, and Bellary District.*

Note. As the Bishop of Madras cannot divest himself of responsibilities regarding the English congregations and mission work in these areas, the Bishops of the Trichy, Mysore, and Madras dioceses shall work in the closest consultation and co-operation.

VIII. *The Districts of Anantapur, Cuddapah, Kurnool, Mahbubnagar, and Raichur.*

IX. *Dornakal (the area of the Dornakal Diocese in Hyderabad State), the districts of Guntur, Kistna, West Godavari, East Godavari, Vizagapatam, Ganjam and the Agency.*

Note. This area will need an assistant bishop.

X. *Hyderabad City, the British Enclave and Hyderabad State, (the remainder of the Nizam's territory now worked by the Wesleyans, excluding the area included in other dioceses).*

The sub-committee was asked to continue its work and get further information concerning these areas, showing the population thereof, the number of Christians in each area by Churches, and other details. The Committee was asked further to gather information on the cost of Bishoprics, methods of election, the period of organization as modified by the present action, the

machinery needed for organizing Diocesan Councils, the setting up of transitory bodies, etc.

The Committee was reconstituted as follows :—

The Bishop of Madras, (Convener).

Revs. C. H. Monahan, Meshach Peter and George Parker, and
Messrs. W. Jeevaretnam and G. V. Job.

These resolutions are now published not because they are in any sense final or even because they have been approved by the Committee, as is clearly shown in the resolutions themselves. They now go to the Joint Committee which will meet in Madras at the end of November and if approved by the Joint Committee will then go to the Churches and areas concerned for further consideration and to call forth their opinions. No area therefore need look upon these resolutions as in any sense final but may at any time voice their own opinions with regard to them. It is distinctly hoped that after the Joint Committee has met and either approved of these resolutions or substituted others for them that the recommendations of that Committee will go to all the Churches and Councils concerned and receive from them careful consideration. The Continuation Committee believes that the general principles adopted are for the good of the work. They also believe that the division made is as good as any that they could now make, but they are anxious to call forth the suggestions of all those who are vitally concerned with the matter in the hopes that the ultimate result will be for the good of all parts of the Church and especially for the building up of the whole Church throughout the whole of South India.

Confirmation

The aim of this paper is to state briefly the general Anglican view about Confirmation. Confirmation is not a Sacrament, in the sense that it is not 'given unto us, ordained by Christ himself', as the Catechism has it. and no Anglican has ever denied that we cannot find any text in the Gospels which commands the followers of Christ to lay hands upon all who have been baptized. It is true that some have argued that the Apostles would not so have acted without Christ's authority; while others have maintained that, as the practice is, from early times, regarded as a part of Baptism and the word Baptism is not infrequently used by the early Fathers to describe the two ceremonies of baptism with water and the laying on of hands, the command to confirm may be held to be implicit in the command to baptize. But these have never been more than private opinions. All that the Prayer Book claims is that, in laying hands upon those who have been already baptized, with prayer that they may receive the Holy Spirit, the Bishop is following the example of the Apostles. For

this claim the authority alleged, since the time of Hooker, (cf. the earlier consultations under Henry VIII which led to the issue of the so-called 'Bishops' Book' of 1537), has been Acts viii. 14-20; xix. 1-7; Hebrews vi. 2. Other passages have been at times brought forward, but their meaning is more disputable and they may here be neglected.

But, before proceeding to an examination of these authorities for Confirmation, it will be well to deal briefly with Article XXV. Here it is stated 'There are two Sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in the Gospel, that is to say, Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord', of which matter there is now no need to speak further. The Article then proceeds, 'Those five commonly called Sacraments, that is to say, Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and extreme Unction, are not to be counted for Sacraments of the Gospel, being such as have grown partly of the corrupt following of the Apostles, partly are states of life allowed in the Scriptures; but yet have not the like nature of Sacraments with Baptism, and the Lord's Supper, for that they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God.' The exact meaning of this Article is obscure. It was repeatedly urged by Puritan objectors to the Prayer Book that the words of the Article were irreconcilable with the claim in the Confirmation Service that the Bishop was following the example of the Apostles, for Confirmation could not be called a state of life and must therefore be due to 'the corrupt following of the Apostles', but no real answer was ever made to them. I think that it must be admitted that the wording of the Article is reprehensibly loose. All that one can say is that the Reformers were anxious to distinguish Confirmation according to the form prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer from that previously in use, where the 'form' was said to be 'I sign thee with the sign of the cross and confirm thee with the chrism of salvation, in the Name' etc., and the 'matter' of the rite to be the anointing of the candidate with chrism. (S. Thomas Aquinas. *Summa Theol.* pt. 3, qu. lxxiii. 1.) They wished to insist upon the Scriptural ceremony of the laying on of hands. Already in the first Prayer Book of Edward VI (1549), though the signing with the cross is retained, the Bishop is ordered to lay his hand upon the head of the candidate and there is no use of chrism.

A second difference from the service in the unreformed Church, due, in part at least, to the influence of Continental Reformers, was the great stress laid upon the requirement that the person to be confirmed must receive instruction in the essentials of the Christian faith, for which purpose a catechism was provided. In the Prayer Book of 1549 the Bishop or someone appointed by him was ordered to examine the candidates at the time of the Confirmation service. Later it was thought sufficient that the minister presenting the candidates should instruct them according to the form provided. In our present Prayer Book the service, after an opening exhortation, proceeds as follows: 'Then shall the Bishop say, Do ye here,

in the presence of God, and of this congregation, renew the solemn promise and vow that was made in your name at your Baptism: ratifying and confirming the same in your own persons, and acknowledging yourselves bound to believe, and to do, all those things, which your Godfathers and Godmothers then undertook for you? And every one shall audibly answer, I do.' There was no such question ordered in the Book of 1549, but a rubric gave, among the reasons for Confirmation, the desirability that children should, when they have come to years of discretion, 'openly before the church, ratify and confess' the promises made for them at their Baptism. There is not, so far as I know, any good reason to think that the use of the word 'confirming' in this opening question has any special importance, as if it meant that the purpose of the service was that the candidate might now 'confirm' the promises made at his Baptism on his behalf. The question is preliminary to the service itself. The objections of the Puritans and general usage, as illustrated by the rubrics at the end of the Catechism and at the beginning of the Confirmation service itself and by the final exhortation in the service for the Public Baptism of Infants, show that the main purpose of the service of Confirmation is that the candidate may be CONFIRMED or strengthened by the gift of the Holy Spirit—

Now Calvin believed that, from the Bible, it was possible to discover a complete system of Church order, but the Book of Common Prayer, and the English Reformation as a whole, in spite of the veneration with which Calvin and the entire Genevan system were regarded by many Englishmen, both within and without the Established Church, was based upon a different principle, which it is important to understand. Scripture is the supreme rule of *faith*, so that 'whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to Salvation.' (Article VI.) But Scripture is not, according to the teaching of the Prayer Book and Articles, the sole rule of *practice*, in the sense that all ceremonies must have scriptural authority. Here the English Reformers went along with Luther rather than with Zwingli and Calvin, much to the disgust of the Puritans, who were constantly demanding the sweeping away of the 'dregs of Popery'. So 'it is not necessary that Traditions or Ceremonies be in all places one, or utterly like; for at all times they have been divers, and may be changed according to the diversities of countries, times, and men's manners, so that nothing be ordained against God's Word. Whosoever through his private judgement, willingly and purposely, doth openly break the traditions and ceremonies of the Church, which be not repugnant to the Word of God, and be ordained and approved by common authority, ought to be rebuked openly.' (Article XXXIV.) The same principle is laid down in the statement at the beginning of the Prayer Book entitled 'Of Ceremonies, why some be abolished and some retained'.

Before we examine the scriptural authority alleged for the use of Confirmation, there is a distinction to be made. Some have denied the ceremony itself ought to be continued: others have attacked only the practice of confining the administration of the rite to Bishops. Bearing this in mind, let us look at the two passages in Acts. In both Apostles are represented as laying hands upon those newly baptized and in both the laying on of their hands is followed by the reception of the Holy Spirit, as shown by the fact that the recipients spoke with tongues. In the former passage, Acts viii. 18, 19, the reception of the Spirit is definitely connected with the laying on of hands by Apostles. Philip does not attempt to perform the rite and it is to the Apostles that Simon makes his offer of money for this power. In the second passage, Acts xix. 1-7, there is no such explicit limitation to an Apostle, but it is in fact S. Paul who lays his hands upon the newly baptized persons, whereas the natural meaning of the Greek is that he did not himself baptize them, which is in accordance with what he himself says in 1 Cor. i. 14-17.

Further, according to this story of the twelve men at Ephesus, baptism is incomplete without the reception of the Holy Ghost and it is after S. Paul has laid his hands upon them that they receive the Holy Ghost. His question in verse 2, 'Did ye receive the Holy Ghost when ye believed?', cannot mean, as the rendering of the Authorised Version, 'Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed?' might suggest, 'Have you experienced the power of the Holy Ghost since you accepted Christ?' If we may use the evidence of S. Paul's own manner of speech, we may paraphrase 'When you were baptized, did you then receive the Holy Spirit,' or even, in the light of what S. Paul did on this occasion, 'When you were baptized, did you receive the laying on of hands?' S. Paul knows nothing of an interior act of acceptance of Christ which is not accompanied by the external act of baptism. I do not think that it is too much to say that it is to him almost a matter of indifference whether he writes 'you believed' or 'you were baptized'. Of course the New Testament is dealing with adult converts and the practice of Infant Baptism raises questions to which it gives no categorical answer. One of these is the practice of separating baptism from the laying on of hands, to which we are accustomed in the Western Church.

The third passage referred to above was Hebrews vi. 2, 'of the teaching of baptisms and laying on of hands'. Here I will quote the opinions of two famous scholars, one an Anglican, the other a Presbyterian. Dr. Westcott, in his commentary, writes: '“The laying on of hands” is the expressive symbol of a solemn blessing (Matt. xix. 13), of the restoration or communication of strength for a definite work. The significance of the act is clearly marked

in healings in the Gospels : Mark vi. 5 (comp. xvi. 18); viii. 23; Luke iv. 40; xiii. 13. It was regarded as natural by those who sought for help : Matt. ix. 18 (comp. Mark v. 23); Mark vii. 32. Compare also Acts xxviii. 8. In the record of the Acts "laying on of hands" appears as (1) the complement of Baptism, the outward rite through which the gift of the Holy Spirit was normally made (Acts viii. 17f.; xix. 6, "Confirmation"); (2) the form of the appointment of "the Seven" (Acts vi. 6, "Ordination"); (3) the mode of separation for a special work (Acts xiii. 3). In the first two cases it is the act of Apostles . . . Primasius (Atto), not unnaturally, limits the phrase to Confirmation : . . . and the close connexion of *ἐπιθεῖν χεῖρας* with *βαπτίζειν* (*βαπτ. ἐπιθ. τε χ.*) may be urged in favour of this view.'

In commenting on the same passage Dr. A. B. Davidson has the following note : 'The second group, baptism and the laying on of hands. The historical sequence is followed in the enumeration. When a sinner repented and believed, the next step was that he was baptized for the remission of sins, and connected with this was prayer and the laying on of hands for the gift of the Holy Ghost (Acts ii. 38, 41; viii. 12, 15-17; comp. Acts ix. 17 with xxii. 16) . . . As through baptism the convert became a member of the house of God, through the laying on of hands he received endowments fitting him for service in the house, and an earnest of his relation to the world to come (vi. 5). The Holy Ghost seems spoken of in the Epistle as the source of extraordinary gifts (ii. 4); He is not regarded as the principle of the Christian life in itself, as in the Pauline Epistles. The laying on of hands was itself a symbol. It did not mean that any gift passed from the person laying on his hands to the person on whom they were laid : it was merely an impressive action accompanying prayer for the person, expressing either the petitioner's deep interest in him by a natural gesture, or marking him as the object on whom the gift prayed for was to fall (Acts viii. 15 with 17; vi. 6; comp. xiii. 3 with xiv. 23).'

In the New Testament, therefore, we find that Apostles did, after Baptism, lay hands upon those already baptized that they might receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. We find that the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews speaks of a rite of laying on of hands which is received by Christians in general and seems to be closely connected with Baptism. It is admittedly impossible to prove either that this ceremony was never omitted or that only Apostles were regarded as competent to perform it, but there is equally certainly no evidence in the New Testament that would justify a categorical denial of such statements about the practice of the Apostolic Church as I have quoted from Dr. Westcott and Dr. Davidson. All that the Church of England is bound to claim, on its own principles, is that it is following an Apostolic practice and that the custom of the Church in

England, as in the West generally, had confined the administration of the rite to Bishops. Granted that it was permissible to have Bishops at all, there is no scriptural authority that would forbid the limitation of the duty of Confirming to the Bishops. It was held, at the Reformation, that the evidence of scripture demanded modification of the rite, but not its abolition. From such a conclusion, unless, with various scholars, we deny the historicity of the passages already referred to in the book of Acts, I find it impossible to dissent.

Finally, as the classical statement of the Anglican position, I cannot do better than quote Hooker on this matter: 'The ancient custom of the Church was, after they had baptized, to add thereto imposition of hands with effectual prayer for the illumination of God's most Holy Spirit to confirm and perfect that which the grace of the same Spirit had already begun in Baptism.

For our means to obtain the graces which God doth bestow are our prayers. Our prayers to that intent are available as well for others as for ourselves. To pray for others is *to bless* them for whom we pray, because prayer procureth the blessing of God upon them, especially the prayer of such as God either most regardeth for their piety and zeal that way, or else regardeth for that their place and calling bindeth them above others unto this duty as it doth both natural and spiritual fathers.

With prayers of spiritual and personal benediction the manner hath been in all ages to use *imposition of hands*, as a ceremony betokening our *restrained desires* to the party, whom we present unto God by prayer.' (Eccl. Pol. Bk. V. lxvi.)

With many questions, historical, theological and practical I cannot now attempt to deal. I would only urge in conclusion that the value of having a solemn ceremony for the admission to full membership of those baptized in infancy, for which they shall be prepared by careful instruction, is very generally recognized: that the ceremony of laying on of hands with prayer is scriptural: that it does not neglect the necessity of faith on the part of the candidate, while laying the main stress, where it ought always to be laid, upon the divine gift of strength for new duties in answer to the prayers of the Church: and that many Bishops and parish priests would bear witness that the preparation and confirming of candidates is, to them, one of the most important and precious parts of their ministry.

A. MICHAEL HOLLIS,

Nazareth, S. India.

Reunion with Nonconformists

By THE BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER

(From THE GUARDIAN)

The conclusion of the arrangement for intercommunion with the Old Catholics has brought to the front our relations with the Nonconformist Churches of this country. That agreement has caused a certain amount of soreness. Why have we started by being friendly with these foreign Churches and passed over those which are close to us at home? I do not think that that feeling of soreness is justified. The Lambeth Conference would have been only too ready to carry on negotiations with English Nonconformists, or with the Evangelical Churches of America, but any advance that we had made had received very little encouragement. A Conference which had met for more than two years at Lambeth between leading representatives of the Free Churches and representatives—mainly bishops—of the Church of England, had put forward agreed proposals. These had been referred to the different Churches concerned. They had been definitely rejected by the Baptists and the Congregationalists, and had not been accepted by any of the other bodies. There was, therefore, nothing to bring before the Lambeth Conference, and that conference devoted its attention to the South Indian scheme, where there was a concrete proposal which it could deal with, and where it might be possible to suggest certain principles of reunion which would have a wider application.

* * * *

The real cause of difference arises from the existence of different ideals. We desire that the Nonconformist Churches should join with us in building up a united Church which should be both National and Catholic. They want us to join them in a loose federation like that existing among the Free Churches at the present time, on the basis of inter-communion and the exchange of pulpits, but with no attempt to solve any of the questions which separate us, or to bring to an end the rivalry of religious bodies in this country.

Those are the two ideals before us. The latter has the appearance of being the easier and offers lines of least resistance, but it is well to say at once that it is really impossible. It would mean the denial of what to the great part of the Church of England are its fundamental principles. It would probably create a schism in the Anglican Communion, and it would not solve any problem. The only solution which will bring anything like real unity is one which aims at the creation of a united Church. It is not probable that anything of the sort would be attained at once, but it

is an end worth working for, as if it were attained it would mean real unity. But there are certain problems which have to be solved.

* * * *

The first is that of unity of faith. This ought not to be difficult, for the differences between us are rather differences of emphasis than of belief. The Nonconformist Bodies are orthodox Christians who believe in the fundamental truths of the Incarnation and the Atonement. There is among some of them an element of Modernism, but there is that also in the Church of England. They, like us, accept the Scriptures as the fundamental basis of faith, and all of them believe (and some of them use) the Creed. Dr. Garvie once reminded his Congregationalist friends that while it was quite true that they had preserved their orthodoxy without having any formal Creed, he doubted whether they would have done so if they had not been surrounded by Churches which preserved the traditional Creed. There is behind the objection held by some to a Creed the question of Scripture and tradition. That has been brought to the front by the agreement which is proposed with the Orthodox. In that agreement it is stated, the supremacy of Scripture having been already maintained, that the revelation of Christ is completed in tradition. There are some who are determined to have nothing to do with tradition and entirely ignore the fact that the teaching which they give is really dependent upon it. It is to tradition that we owe the Scriptures; it is to tradition that we owe the Canon of Scripture, as our Articles tell us. The doctrine of the Trinity is the teaching of the Scriptures as completed by tradition. It is to tradition that we owe the formularization of our faith as expressed in the Christian Creed.

* * * *

The second point would be unity of worship. Here the difficulty ought to be very slight. We have long found the Act of Uniformity a burden in the Church of England. Under the varied conditions of modern life great variety in worship should be allowed. That, to a certain extent, we have practically attained. We should have done it formally as well but for the stupidity of Parliament. A union with Nonconformity would mean a relaxation in both directions of the restraint of the Prayer Book and a unity which would be attained by mutual intercourse and influence.

The third point would be unity in the Sacraments. I do not think there is any greater difference in Sacramental belief between the Church of England and Nonconformists than there is between different sections of the Church of England. The basis of unity will be attained when it is recognized that it is on the spiritual values of the Sacrament that we should unite and not on any definition.

* * * *

The fourth problem is that presented by the contrast between the parochial and the Congregational system. I do not think that in London or

in our towns and cities there will be any serious difficulty in conciliating the two systems: we have really done it already. Two things are clear: the one the great value of the parochial system, if properly worked, by which the parish priest has responsibilities for every one—certainly for every one who needs him—within a given area. The second is that that system alone is too narrow for the present day, and it must be modified by the Congregationalist element. The number of competing religious bodies is far too large and is a cause of weakness to the Christian Church; but we do not want to substitute for it a seventeenth century ideal of rigid uniformity. The difficulty will be greater in the villages. The competition of church and chapel destroys the unity of religious life in many places. In some where the church is failing to do its duty Nonconformity provides a spiritual influence which would otherwise be lost. The existence of these two conflicting needs presents a real difficulty.

* * * *

Lastly there is the question of the ministry. I am quite convinced that no unity will be worth anything which is not based on an unified ministry, and no unified ministry can come except on the basis of episcopacy. That has been accepted in South India; it has been accepted in an imperfect manner in the North Indian Conference; it is repudiated at present by English Congregationalists and Baptists. The South Indian proposals suggest the way in which a unity may be brought about without asking any one to deny the spiritual validity of his existing Orders. The declaration made by the Lambeth Conference, that Nonconformist ministries were real ministries of the Word and Sacrament in the Universal Church, was guarded by statements which meant that that did not imply full recognition. It was to be taken side by side with certain statements about episcopacy. We mean to preserve and adhere to our ideal of the historic episcopacy as a necessary basis of Christian unity, but wish quite definitely to recognize the spiritual value of Nonconformist ministries and Sacraments.

* * * *

I have sketched the ideal that we must aim at. The easy path of establishing some sort of general intercommunion before we have solved questions of Faith and Order would not really bring us nearer together. The Lambeth Conference proposed what may be called 'economic' intercommunion, on the lines which were suggested with the Eastern Church, both to meet practical necessities and to show our desire for closer approach. What may be suggested further as representing the lines on which we can approach one another is the formation everywhere of United Christian Councils, in order that we may co-operate together in all the things in which we can co-operate and for mutual discussion, of both clergy and laity, on the questions which separate us. The difficulty of reunion at present lies not so much in the difficulty of the leaders coming together as of the rank and file.

Many Ways but the Old Gospel

By ILICO

(From *THE BRITISH WEEKLY*, September 8, 1932)

Here is the issue for us: there are various ways of worshipping God; there is the Puritan way, the Methodist way, the Catholic way, the Quaker way; are we to say that one way only is legitimate, or that any of these ways is illegitimate? In particular, is the Catholic way illegitimate? We are not asking whether Roman theology or Anglo-Catholic theology is as sound and adequate as Calvin's or whoever be his modern representative; we are concerned with a question, not of theology, but of worship. Difficult as it is for some to see it, this is really quite distinct from the controversy between Romanism and Protestantism. Many like myself must know men, calling themselves Catholics whose fundamental Protestantism is no more in doubt than our own. We hear them preach, and their Gospel is 'the old Gospel,' as we hear it too infrequently in our own churches, we hear them pray and we know that their religion is ours; 'Catholic' as they may be in ritual, we cannot accuse them of superstition. 'Catholics' they are, but Roman Catholics they emphatically are not.

THE SWEDISH WAY

I believe we must make up our minds that some people are by nature Catholics, as others are Puritans or Quakers, and that this spiritual or temperamental 'make-up' is not a question of theology at all. I must not be understood to mean by this that the difference between Rome and Geneva is a mere matter of temperament, not of theology; far from it! But, just as the Roman Church has often known Puritan movements, so there are Protestants whose natural mode of worship is what we call 'Catholic.' When we British Protestants see a Crucifix or a cope, we think immediately of Roman doctrine and Roman superstition; but if we go into the great churches of Sweden, I understand that we shall see divine service celebrated with the ritual and the vestments of the mediæval Church; yet we cannot be better Protestants than are the Swedes! In Sweden, in Germany, in Scotland and in England, there are many Protestants to whom 'Catholic' or symbolic or sacramental worship is the natural expression of their Protestantism and to whom the austerity of Puritanism is alien.

If this is a fact, we must make the best of it. There is a wing of Anglo-Catholicism that seems quite out of place in any Reformed Church.

but it is a great mistake to regard Anglo-Catholicism as a whole as a *Rome-ward* movement; it must be judged by its Gospel, not by its ritual. A learned friend, who knows both, assures me that there are many Romanists at heart in the Protestant Churches and many Protestants at heart in the Church of Rome; that may be so. In any case, it should not be denied that it is the Gospel and not any particular form of worship which is the hall-mark of Protestantism.

REJOICING IN DIVERSITY

What is the right solution of the problem? A split? The setting up of a separate 'cause' for every variety of Christian temperament? We have had far too much of that; it is very near to the sin of schism. A truly national Church will rejoice in diversity and make provision for all within the ample riches of the Gospel. A truly national Church will make room for the Free Churches, not by turning out the Anglo-Catholics root and branch, not by imposing upon all a uniform, compromise service, but by meeting the spiritual needs of all by the proclamation of the everlasting Gospel through sermon *and* hymn *and* symbol *and* sacrament *and* Quaker meeting. Then, by a far greater sharing and mutual understanding we shall rub off the awkward corners of our temperaments and learn to comprehend with all saints what is the length and breadth and depth and height, and to know the love of Christ which passeth knowledge.

Those who have read that most fascinating book, Dr. Albert Schweitzer's *Memoirs of Childhood and Youth*, will remember how lasting an advantage he claims to have gained from the fact that he worshipped as a child in a church that was shared by Protestants and Catholics; the Protestants had the use of the nave, the Catholics of the chancel. Protestant he remains, as his fathers before him; but as a boy he would gaze over the golden altar and the candlesticks past the images of Joseph and the Virgin Mary, flooded with light from the chancel windows, and so through the windows over trees, roofs and clouds, till 'my gaze wandered from the finite to the infinite, and my soul was wrapped in peace and quiet.' The Communion of Saints is wider than our sects; we must pray for a Church that is no more a sect.

A Message to the World Mission at a Time of World Crisis

JOHN R. MOTT

(First ten pages omitted for want of space)

IMPERATIVE DEMAND TO ENTER UPON THE THIRD STAGE OF CO-OPERATION

The Herrnhut Meeting took decidedly advanced ground on the subject of co-operation. They had before them abundant evidence from all parts of the world of immense areas of unmet human need as well as of ever-widening opportunity. At the same time, as responsible representatives of the Boards and Churches, they had come together burdened by the knowledge of world-wide, acute financial stringency in the face of which many societies have already been compelled to make very serious and crippling retrenchments and may find it necessary to effect further reductions. Not a few expressed the fear that for a long time the Churches will have to carry on with little appreciable increase in present resources. This critical situation, and above all the desire to realize other and higher values implicit in the prayer of our Lord 'that they may be one,' led us to consider afresh the whole subject of co-operation.

While recognizing the marked progress in co-operative effort achieved since the World Missionary Conference at Edinburgh over twenty years ago, we arrived at a united conviction that the missionary forces of the various Christian communions stand on the threshold of a new period of co-operation—a period in which the objectives, principles, and spirit of missionary co-operation and their practical and early application shall be considered and acted upon more seriously, thoroughly, and sacrificially than ever before.

It was recognized by us all that the failure to enter upon what was characterized as the third stage of missionary co-operation (the first stage being the period preceding the Edinburgh Conference, and the second the period between Edinburgh and the recent Jerusalem Conference) will be attended with alarming results. For example, the leadership of the Christian forces in all lands touched by Christian missions will be impoverished and this in turn means the impoverishment of the growing Church membership. In a number of important fields initiative may pass from the hands of the Christians into those of the secularistic and anti-Christian movements. The confidence of men and women capable of giving large and much-needed support to the missionary programme will be shaken and withdrawn. One of the most compelling grounds of appeal for the allegiance to the mission cause of the new generation—a generation far from having been won—will be forfeited. Continuance of the present practice of division precludes the securing from the smaller countries and Churches the benefit of their largest

and best contribution toward the enrichment and expansion of the missionary programme. The world mission will fail to meet its present unexampled opportunities all over the map, and will fall short of coming to successful grapple with sinister, aggressive, ably led, and united anti-religious movements which are rapidly gathering momentum.

At Herrnhut the representatives of the British missionary societies reported that at their recent annual meeting at High Leigh, in view of the present situation and impending perils, they had adopted definite plans for an early and united examination of the possibilities of closer co-operation. The representatives of the united women's Boards of North America told of a similar inquiry recently initiated in America. It was decided by the Meeting that similar studies and action might well be undertaken in other countries. It was also agreed that with the help of the International Missionary Council collaboration between the various national councils or groups and with the younger Churches should be fostered. It was clearly understood that any final policies must be the formulation of the Churches and societies concerned.

PRICE OF TRIUMPHANT UNITY

The Herrnhut Meeting calls upon the leaders and members of Mission Boards and of the older and the younger Churches to further in every way in their power this divinely inspired initiative. If in some new measure the implications of the high-priestly prayer of our Lord are to be realised, so far as His world-embracing programme is concerned, it means that those to whom these words may come, together with His true followers everywhere, must associate themselves in paying great prices. He who ever enjoined upon His followers to count the cost, knew how costly is the widening of His reign. And He would have us count the cost with reference to paying it.

What will it cost if the vision and initiative of Herrnhut—and behind it that of the Mount of Olives—are to be realized? It will cost dedicated personalities—persons in positions of responsibility and influence who will definitely dedicate themselves to the larger discovery and fulfilment of the mind of their Lord so that they may draw together in plan and action those who bear His name. It will cost fresh, creative, courageous, constructive, unselfish, co-operative thinking; we shall not drift into the answer to His prayer and into giving tremendous reality to His wish that we present a much more nearly united front, and, therefore, the triumphant apologetic to an unbelieving world. It will demand resolute, heroic, persevering application of accepted guiding principles to actual or concrete situations no matter how many at first oppose and no matter how long the time required: It will require open-minded consideration of the sincere objections of those

with whom we differ and an honest evaluation of experience as the process of joint action unfolds. It will often necessitate siege work and the exercise of great patience and undiscourageable resolution. It will involve mutual sacrifice; there has been discovered no way to ensure vital co-operation and enduring unity apart from the way of the Cross—Christ's way. It means on the part of the Churches and Boards of different Communion, nations and races, nothing less than a greatly accelerated pace in the actual pooling, not only of experience and ideas but also of men, money, and other resources.

At every advance stage in the pathway of achieving any Christian unity worthy of the name, the price to be paid will necessitate *great acts of trust*—trust in our unerring guiding principles, trust in one another, trust in the One who wills our unity. The genuine and triumphant union of the Christians of different nations, races, and Communion is through all a super-human undertaking and process—the Living Lord working in His followers 'both to will and to do.'

JOHN R. MOTT,

Chairman of the International Missionary Council

The South India Scheme

An Open Letter to the Metropolitan

The following Open Letter has been addressed to the Bishop of Calcutta, Metropolitan of India.

My Lord Bishop—

As we understand that there are some in India who have been troubled by a document issued by certain professors and other clergy at Oxford criticizing the action of the Synod of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon, in relation to the scheme for South Indian reunion, we have, in answer to requests which have been made to us, considered the difficulties that have been raised, and have drawn up the following statement on the Christian ministry and the authority of the Church which will, we hope, assist in meeting these criticisms.

The following is our opinion on the questions that have been raised :—

The Christian ministry is the gift of God through Jesus Christ to the Church. For we are told that 'God hath set some in the Church, first Apostles, secondly Prophets, thirdly Teachers,' and again that Christ 'gave some Apostles and some Prophets, and some Evangelists, and some Pastors and Teachers.'

The traditional form of the Christian ministry is episcopacy, the essential elements in which are the threefold order of bishops, priests and deacons, and the rule of episcopal Consecration and Ordination. While there is not, as we believe, any Scriptural authority for this ministry in its developed form, we accept it on the authority of the Church as inspired by God's Holy Spirit.

We believe that this order is an essential part of the life of the Christian Church, and that all other ministries are irregular and imperfect, and in particular that just as the setting up of separated ministries is both the result and the cause of Christian disunion, so no true unity can come except through a ministry united on the basis of the traditional Church Order.

While we hold that other ministries are in varying degrees imperfect and irregular, we cannot hold that sincere Christian bodies whose separation has not arisen from any act of schism on the part of their present members but is the result of past history, and who desire to fulfil our Lord's command in celebrating the Holy Communion, are without sacramental grace, nor, as our Lord Jesus Christ is the Minister of every Sacrament, can we hold that He gives a different sort of grace to those who have not an episcopal ministry.

We recognize the soundness of the rule of the Christian Church, which would forbid in normal circumstances intercommunion with those who are separated from us, but we believe that the Church has authority to dispense with that as other ecclesiastical rules, if the well-being of the Church and of the individual Christian soul demands it.

We consider that the resolution of the Lambeth Conference which would not question the discretion of a bishop who allowed such intercommunion in special cases represents a legitimate exercise of the dispensing power of the Church, and we consider that in the case of the South Indian Churches, where the barriers of separation have been broken down by the all but final acceptance of the scheme of reunion, intercommunion among those who as we believe under the guidance of God's Holy Spirit are united in the active promotion of Christian fellowship may equally be allowed without any derogation from Catholic Order.

We venture to quote as supporting our conception of the dispensing authority of the Christian Church the following extracts from a work of a Greek theologian, Professor Dyovouniotes, *Concerning the Union of the Anglican and Orthodox Churches and the Validity of Anglican Ordinations* (Athens, 1932.) He writes (page 20):—"Economy contrasted with "precision," that is, the precise and strict observance of the canons, means an

observance of the canons which is not precise and strict, and therefore a deviation from the canons. The Church has used economy either occasionally or continuously for adequate reason, for a *causa justa*, as the Romans (that is, the Roman law) said, from whom the Church probably took over economy. And this adequate reason is the salvation of souls, which is the final aim of the Church.' And again, 'The true teaching of the Eastern Church, according to which the Church as Steward of the divine grace can recognize invalid sacraments as valid, and valid (sacraments) as invalid' (page 22).

We notice that the Oxford professors and theologians conclude with the statement that in certain circumstances they would no longer be in a position to advise an Anglican priest to continue to minister in the Church of India. We venture to think that such a statement implies a misconception of Catholic Order which lies perilously near schismatic action. However great may be the value of the advice of individual theologians to the Christian Church, it is not they but the Synods of the Church (whether in England or India) that have authority in interpreting what is Catholic and what is not. If theologians place their own authority above the canonical authority of the Church expressed in properly constituted Synods, it is a reversal of Catholic Order.

We are,

Yours very sincerely,

A. C. GLOUCESTER,

THOMAS OXON,

EDWIN JAMES PALMER,

W. R. MATTHEWS,

(formerly Bishop of Bombay.)

Dean of Exeter.

E. W. WATSON,

Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Oxford.

Book Reviews

The History of the Anglo-Catholic Revival from 1845. (By W. J. Sparrow Simpson, D.D. George Allen and Unwin Ltd., London. 8sh. 6d.)

Dr. Simpson has taken the opportunity of the celebration of the centenary of the Oxford Movement to give his interpretation of the Anglo-Catholic Revival from 1845, just after Newman's going over to the Roman Catholic Church. He has set forth in the book his conception of this movement with its basis upon the doctrine of 'Apostolic Succession,' and the decision of the Courts on doctrine, and shows further the rise of ritualism, and the discussion concerning the Eucharistic vestments, Confession, and Absolution. That it is a thoroughgoing and able presentation of the case as seen by an Anglo-Catholic, all must admit, but one wonders whether the time has not yet come when all such sectional and partly presentation should be done away with and groups of scholars should get together and do some studying and some thinking together in order to come to a common mind.

Dr. Simpson has hardly added any new information by the publication of this book. He has presented certain aspects of history as he understands them but much of what he says will not be accepted by those who are not already in agreement with him. Consequently we wonder whether the book will win any converts to his way of thinking. Could he have been associated with eminent Church scholars of the Church of Scotland, the English Independents and Continental Lutherans in a fresh study of the whole situation they together could undoubtedly have produced a book that would have had a profound effect upon all scholars. We believe that in connection especially with the world Conference on Faith and Order this method of group studying and group thinking should be begun in dead earnest and scholars should sit together until they have thrashed out the facts, and thought their way through those facts to a common conclusion. If scientists can do that in the material world why cannot Church Historians do that in realm of the Church?

What is Moksha? (By Dr. A. J. Appasamy. Re. 1-4-0.)

The Cross and Indian Thought. (By Mr. V. Chakkarai. Re. 1-4-0.)

Ramon Lull. (By P. G. Bridge, As. 12.)

These three books, published by the Christian Literature Society of Madras, are in the series of 'Indian Studies' and the 'Bhaktas of the World' edited by Dr. Appasamy and all three of them are in keeping with the work that Dr. Appasamy has done in not only publishing books himself but getting others also to write. We trust that these series will be very much expanded and that many will be able to produce such excellent volumes as these for the use of South Indian students and others.

Clippings

The Dean of Durham and Intercommunion

(From 'The British Weekly')

Speaking at a meeting in celebration of Methodist Union in Durham on Saturday, Bishop Welldon said he thought that nothing would please John Wesley more than intercommunion between the Church he adorned and the Church he founded. For his own part, the Bishop said, he preferred intercommunion between the Established Church and the Free Churches rather than any such Union as the Methodists had achieved. They did not agree,

but they did not wish their differences to keep them apart. Referring to Free Churchmen preaching in cathedrals, he said he had received much 'abuse' for inviting Dr. J. H. Jowett to preach at Durham. Since then Free Churchmen had preached in Westminster Abbey and even in Canterbury Cathedral, at the invitation of the Archbishop, and he was glad that Durham had led the way.

Presbyterians and Congregationalists

Conference on Union

(From 'The Christian World')

Intense interest was shown on Tuesday night October 4, 1932, in the conference on 'Union between Congregationalists and Presbyterians.' The lecture hall at Snow Hill Church was originally engaged, but the big church itself had to be opened, and it was crowded to the doors. Rev. H. C. Carter, presiding, said it had become apparent that (1) their present denominational divisions did not correspond to realities, and (2) that their divisions were a source of weakness, hindering the witness of Christ's Church.

Rev. James Reid, of Eastbourne, was to have opened the conference from the Presbyterian side. In his regretted absence through eye trouble Dr. C. Anderson Scott, one of the most eminent of English Presbyterian scholars, led off with an extraordinarily interesting and farsighted survey of the general problem of Christian Union. He was definitely opposed to precipitancy, to an exaggerated view of the dangers of denominationalism. There was an alternative way of dealing with 'our miserable divisions'—and that was to transform their nature, to avoid making them

'miserable.' But Dr. Scott cordially endorsed the view expressed in THE CHRISTIAN WORLD last week that the only division that can be defended is that between a prophetic and experimental Church and a priestly and credal Church. He proceeded, after this cautious exordium, to give his reasons in favour of 'Presby-gational' union. First, 'We like each other'—by which Dr. Scott implied a likeness of moral, religious and theological outlook.

What would they gain? Presbyterians at least would gain a greater share in the task of evangelization, a broader basis, and a wider fellowship. Dr. Scott frankly surveyed the difficulties in the way, chiefly questions of organization, but left the impression that he saw nothing impossible in devising a scheme for a United Church which would hold stable the balance between corporate control and individual rights. The real difficulty was on the point of a creed. Concession would be required on both sides. Could they not join in accepting, as an intellectual basis, not a creed, but 'a joyful declaration of what the Church stands for, and its message to mankind'?

Presbyterians and Congregationalists

(From 'The British Weekly')

Union is in the air. The song of Thanksgiving that broke from the lips of Reunited Methodism spread far beyond the walls of the Albert Hall, and made melody in the heart of the whole Christian Church. Under the inspiration of that great achievement the Congregational Assembly met in the Snow Hill Church on Tuesday evening to consider the possibilities of union between the Presbyterian Church of England and Congregationalism. In the absence of the Rev. James Reid, whose illness is so deeply regretted, Dr.

C. Anderson Scott, of Cambridge, kindly consented at very short notice to state the case from the Presbyterian side, whilst Principal E. J. Price, of Bradford, voiced the Congregational point of view: Considerations of time and place render it impossible to make more than a brief reference to this important conference in this week's issue, and we shall return to it next week, to report Dr. Anderson Scott's weighty speech and the discussion that followed the opening addresses.

Principal Price's Viewpoint

Beginning his speech with a glowing tribute to the churches of the Presbyterian order—their history, their fidelity, their scholarship and their ministry—Principal Price observed that both Presbyterianism and Congregationalism were cradled in Calvinism, and they separated from each other, not on a theological issue, but on their view of Church fidelity. They differed as to the means by which the Church could best discharge its functions in the world and as to the light thrown upon this matter by the actual practice of the New Testament. The result was that whilst both rejected episcopacy in its Roman and Anglican forms as being without New Testament sanction and as an actual hindrance to the realisation of the true ends of the Church, Presbyterianism retained the compact organisation of episcopacy whilst constitutionalising and democratising its modes of action, whereas Congregationalism rejected all organised authority outside the local Church, and sought the direct realisation of the authority of Christ in the actual fellowship of believers in each place

through the renewal of the New Testament experience of His presence. Each of these conceptions had made significant contributions to the development of the Church Catholic.

Principal Price carried the assembly with him when he claimed that Presbyterian and Congregational ministers and laymen find themselves at home in each other's churches and pulpits. 'Many of our finest Congregational office-bearers are men of Presbyterian upbringing, who, finding themselves in a locality where there is no Presbyterian Church, have thrown themselves heartily into the life and work of the local Congregational Church.' In Church polity there was a great deal more likeness between them than was often supposed. Many apparent differences were matters of nomenclature. Speaking generally, the Congregational deacon was the Presbyterian elder, and the crucial point of difference lay in the powers attached to the Deacon's Board and the Kirk Session respectively.

The Church Meeting

It was customary among Congregationalists to say that Congregationalism stood and fell by the Church meeting as the most characteristic expression of their most fundamental principles. 'The Church meeting is no more infallible than the Pope, but at least we do believe that it is here that Christ speaks to His waiting people, and gives them wisdom, courage and vision, when their sole aim and desire is to honour His command.' Yet they needed to recover the power and vitality of the Church meeting if they were to justify their Congregational position.

Having referred to certain ways in which the two Churches approximated to each other, Principal Price mentioned three broad issues in respect of which an actual union with Presbyterianism presented difficulties which many might regard as insuperable—the conception of the Church, the conception of the ministry and of ordination, and the demand for a Confessional basis. The speech, which was lucidly expressed and lacked nothing in candour, was listened to with eager attention.

Methodist Reunion

(From 'The Christian World')

It has taken nineteen years for Methodism to become united. A long time, and a wearily intricate task. But the outcome proves that the spirit of unity can overcome the most complicated difficulties. The practical groundwork of this union was a readjustment of the functions of ministers and laymen in Church government; the spiritual groundwork was an all-round agreement that visible Christian unity is so great a boon, so clear a duty, that long-treasured opinions must be sacrificed—may be sacrificed—for this great end. I do not see how any Free Church denomination can escape the challenge of these facts in regard to its own duty in the matter of unity.

Is visible Christian unity indeed so priceless a boon? Even in such a limited form as visible Free Church unity, I believe it would

win the hearts of millions who are outside the Church. Talk as we will of our 'specific witness' and our 'principles,' Protestant disunity will always be a scandal in the eyes of the world. I cannot help pointing to the extraordinarily sympathetic interest which the daily Press has taken in the Methodist achievement. Christian unity is news—and good news. For a long time past Rome has had a 'pull' in the matter of Press publicity which is by no means to be ascribed to any 'hidden hand' in Fleet-street. Rome wins public attention because she has the imposing strength of unity. Why should not Protestantism speak with a like impressive power? This is the 'manward' argument only. There is also a 'Godward' argument, compellingly powerful with those who brood much upon God's fatherhood and man's brotherhood.

Methodist Reunion—(*Continued*).

(From 'The Record')

The union which has now been consummated is an example to the still-divided Churches of Christendom as to how a thing of the kind ought to be secured. For this union is no mere adjustment of agencies. Nor is it an act of mere prudence, as when competing groups, each aware of the strain, decide to pool their resources and to call in their adventurous

spirits from unprofitable outposts. It is a union also entirely free from pride and patronage in one quarter, and equally free from the mere sense of relief, or of escape, in any quarter. It is the coming together of self-respecting Churches, and of Churches which respect each other.

The Free Churches and Reunion

(From 'The British Weekly')

We fully concur in the dissatisfaction expressed by the Free Church Federal Council that so little practical action has resulted from the discussions between their representatives and the Bishops. They remind the Bishops that these conversations began ten years ago, and hint that unless there is some definite outcome they will be unwilling to continue them. In all that lapse of time every possible question at issue must have been exhaustively debated, so that there can be no reason for delay except an unwillingness of the Church to give the conclusions practical effect. This slow progress and fruitless discussion contrasts very unfavourably

with the smooth and swift passage accorded to the negotiations with the Old Catholics and the Orthodox Eastern Churches. Moreover, while for the Free Churchmen it was laid down that intercommunion must be the final and not a preliminary stage on the way to Church union, intercommunion with the Old Catholics and the Easterns was accorded at the outset, without waiting for full union. The Bishops are not wholly to blame, for the Anglo-Catholics, who in the Assembly, its committees, and the Press have fought against even the limited concessions proposed by the Bishops.

Free Churches and Reunion

(From 'The Guardian')

The Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England held its fourteenth annual assembly last week, at the Baptist Church House, Southampton Row, W.C.1. The new Moderator of the Council, the Rev. Dr. W. Lewis Robertson, presided. After a discussion on the question of closer relations between the Free Churches, the council adopted the following resolution, moved by the Rev. Dr. Carnegie Simpson:

The council, having had the subject of

unity among the Free Churches brought before it, records its conviction that the needs of religion in the land, especially in the country areas and in view of the redistribution of populations, make an imperative call from God for the frank and earnest consideration of the question of union among these Churches. It instructs its committee on the subject to prepare a considered statement of the spiritual urgency of the matter and also of its ecclesiastical possibilities for presentation to next year's meeting of council.

Lambeth Conversations

Dr. Robertson, as secretary, gave an account of the conversations at Lambeth on reunion between representatives of the Council and a corresponding number of Bishops, and the following resolution was passed:

'The Council, having heard the report of its representatives appointed to confer with representatives of the Church of England, approves generally and resolves to reappoint the committee. In doing so, however, the Council expresses its disappointment that these pro-

longed conversations, which were begun more than ten years ago, have not led to more development of practical recognition and co-operation between the Church of England and the Free Churches; and, while glad to learn of the continued friendly spirit existing in the conference, and that plans for co-operation are under discussion, cannot but feel that it will hardly be possible to continue these conversations indefinitely with hopefulness or even reality, if practical proposals for action cannot be agreed upon.'

The South India Scheme

(From 'The British Weekly')

Supporters of the scheme for Church Union in South India have been cheered by the letter addressed to the Metropolitan of India by five of the most learned Anglican theologians, including the Bishops of Gloucester and Oxford. The other signatories are Bishop Palmer, Dean Matthews and Canon E. W. Watson, Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Oxford. These authorities use language with regard to the Episcopal Order which has been highly displeasing to Anglo-Catholics. The following words from the letter deserve to be placed on record:—

'The traditional form of the Christian Ministry is Episcopacy, the essential elements in which are the threefold order of bishops, priests and deacons, and the rule of Episcopal Consecration and Ordination. While there is not, as we believe, any Scriptural authority for this ministry in its developed form, we accept it on the authority of the Church as inspired by God's Holy Spirit.'

While themselves holding fast by the historic Episcopate, these eminent writers declare further:—

'We cannot hold that sincere Christian bodies, whose separation has not arisen from

any act of schism on the part of their present members, but is the result of past history, and who desire to fulfil our Lord's command in celebrating the Holy Communion, are without sacramental grace, nor, as our Lord Jesus Christ is the Minister of every Sacrament, can we hold that He gives a different sort of grace to those who have not an episcopal ministry.'

The Church has authority, it is argued, to permit inter-communion in such cases as those of South India. The letter is drawn up in that wise, liberal and reconciling spirit which we should expect from Dr. Headlam, Dr. Matthews and their colleagues. A vigorous reply appeared in Friday's 'Church Times,' and we can well understand how objectionable the letter must seem to those who desire an early re-union between the Churches of Rome and England. The party of Lord Halifax was prepared to go a long way towards complete submission to the Pope, but Rome has refused to yield an inch of ground. The Anglo-Catholics hold at this moment a curiously isolated position. They have turned their backs on the Protestant Churches, and Rome will have nothing to do with them.

OUTSTANDING VALUES!

PRECISION THERMOMETERS

"SURGICO"



BEST MAKE

Made of special *Normal-Glass*, triangular magnifying lenses and clear, distinct and easily read black figures. Self-registering in $\frac{1}{4}$ minute. 'Shakedown' easily. Passed the most exacting and severe tests. Sold with a printed guarantee as to *accuracy* and *reliability*. Used in several hospitals in India. In Nickel case with pocket clip, As. 14 each. Rs. 10 per dozen. In screwed coloured Vulcanite case, with pocket clip, Re. 1-4 each, Rs. 14-4 per dozen.



"SR" Adhesive Plasters.
Zinc Oxide. In airtight containers. Very useful and lasting quality. Pocket or trunk size. For cuts, wounds, etc. In spools 5 yards long.

Width, 1 $\frac{1}{4}$ 2 3 ins.
Rs. 9 12 15 21 per doz.

Hospital size Rolls. 12 inches wide, 5 yards long.
Re. 1-8 each.

Physician or Household size Rolls. One yard long, 7 inches wide Re. 1-8 each.

Write for Literature.

Goodrich Hot Water Bottles. Best for the Indian climate. Long-lasting, durable and fast-selling.

2 quarts Rs. 3-4 each.
3 " Rs. 3-8 "

Do. With Douche Combined, complete. 2 quarts, Rs. 5-8 each.

Infants' or Face Hot Water Bottles, one pint, Rs. 2-4 each.

Goodrich special list sent *free*. It contains many useful rubber products for home, dispensary and hospital use.



Leading House for Surgical Instruments & Hospital Requisites

Manufacturers of Hernia Trusses, Abdominal Belts and Orthopedic Appliances.

BOMBAY SURGICAL CO., New Church Road, BOMBAY, 4.

Telegrams: 'SURGICO'.

Telephone No. 41936.

THOS. COOK & SON, LTD.

(INCORPORATED IN ENGLAND.)

IN CO-OPERATION WITH WAGONS-LIFTS CO.

Head Office :—Berkeley Street, Piccadilly, LONDON, W. I.

PASSAGES engaged by all lines at same fares as charged by Steamship Companies. Holders of COOK'S tickets met at all ports. Outward passages engaged and tickets supplied from any part of the World to India. Usual reductions obtained for Missionaries, Railway Officials, Families, etc.

BAGGAGE received, stored and forwarded. Cargo shipped to all parts of the World at current rates. Inward consignments such as Hardware, Piecegoods, Machinery, Stores, etc., for Messes and Clubs, cleared and forwarded at special rates. Insurances of all kinds effected on Baggage, Cargo, Livestock, Mess Property, etc.

THE ORIENTAL TRAVELLERS' GAZETTE containing sailing dates and fares of all steamers, together with invaluable information for travellers, sent post free on application.

GOVERNMENT CERTIFICATES accepted. No deposit required.

THOS. COOK & SON (BANKERS), LTD.

(INCORPORATED IN ENGLAND)

Head Office :—Berkeley Street, Piccadilly, LONDON, W. I.

CURRENT AND FIXED DEPOSIT ACCOUNTS opened. Interest allowed. Pay and Pensions collected. Periodical remittances made at current rates. Insurances premia paid.

LETTERS OF CREDIT AND TRAVELLERS' CHEQUES issued, encashable throughout the World.

DRAFTS granted and TELEGRAPHIC TRANSFERS effected on all principal towns.

INSURANCE Life, Accident, Fire, Burglary, effected. Prospectus on application.

300 Offices throughout the World.

**EASTERN OFFICES: BAGHDAD, BOMBAY, CALCUTTA,
COLOMBO, DELHI, MADRAS, RANGOON, SIMLA, and
SINGAPORE.**

Madras Office 1-35 Mount Road.

Telegraphic Address: "COUPON"